UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/555,277	11/02/2005	Takuya Ando	Q91237	4620
65565 7590 10/3 SUGHRUE-265550			EXAMINER	
2100 PENNSY	LVANIA AVE. NW	•	RENWICK, REGINALD A	
WASHINGTON, DC 20037-3213		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3714	
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/555,277	ANDO, TAKUYA				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Reginald A. Renwick	3714				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence address				
	IVIC OFT TO EVOIDE A MO	ONTHIEL OR THIRTY (30) DAVE				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the maili earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC .136(a). In no event, however, may a red d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONI te, cause the application to become ABA	CATION.  sply be timely filed  THS from the mailing date of this communication.  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status		·				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02</u>	November 2005.					
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ Th	☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.					
•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	. 11, 453 O.G. 213:				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are pending in the application						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are rejected.		•				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac	cepted or b) objected to b	by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to th	e drawing(s) be held in abeyan	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	•					
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•					
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	ın priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority documer	nts have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bure						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certified copies not	received.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413) )/Mail Date				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		formal Patent Application				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	6)  Other:	·				

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :1/30/2006; 3/22/2006; 07/06/2007; 10/19/2006.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Information Disclosure Statement

The Information Disclosure Statement filed on 1/30/2006, 3/22/2006, 10/19/2006, 7/06/2007 has been considered for review in the examination of the disclosed invention.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Price (U.S. Patent No. 6,776,715) in view of Olsen (U.S. Patent No. 6,210,275).

Re claim 1: Price discloses a method and apparatus for providing a personal wide are progressive for providing a personal wide area progressive for gaming apparatus that comprises of a plurality of stations (col. 5, lines 34-47) where each of the stations is provided with an identifier unquie to each of the stations (Abstract); and a receiver which receives personal information from the player (Abstract); a first storage which stores the personal information while associating with the identifier (column 1, lines 60-

Art Unit: 3714

Control Number: 10/333,2

65), with respect to each of the stations; a second storage (column 4, lines 24-28), which stores a first play record (column 14, lines 9-14) of the player while associated with the personal information, with respect to each of the stations; a judge which judges whether there exists a second play record which satisfies a first prize requirement among the first play records stored in the second storage (column 14, lines 13-26); a first specifier which specifies a player who satisfies the first prize requirement in a case where there exists the second play record, with reference to the personal information associated with the second play record (Abstract; column 2, lines 1-7); a second specifier plays which specifies a station at which the player specified by the first specifier plays, with reference to the identifier associated with the personal information referred by the first specifier (column 12, lines 19-33);

Price fails to disclose a condition arranger, which changes a condition of the game performed at the station specified by the second specifier so as to be more advantageous to the player specified by the first specifier, and maintains the changed condition until a cancel condition is satisfied. However, Olsen discloses a progressive jackpot game with guaranteed winner that comprises of a successful game round and a changed condition that comprises of a bonus game that reduces the number of possible horses in a race after each successive round wherein the terminating round is reached in which the last game always results in at least one winner through the reduction of possible game outcomes (Abstract; column 4, lines 34-40). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to incorporate the horse race bonus of Olsen into the game

. 0744

Art Unit: 3714

machine of Price because a need exists to combine the excitement of actual horse racing into the environment of linked gaming machines interconnected to a progressive jackpot controller.

Re claim 7: Price discloses a master machine and a plurality of gaming machines, connected with each other via a network (column 2, lines 33-37), each of the gaming machines, wherein the master machine manages at least the personal information in each of the gaming machines (Abstract, column 2, lines 34-38; column 6, lines 16-27).

3. Claims 2 and 3 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prize in view of Olsen in view of Seelig et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,997,400).

Re claims 2 and 3: Prize/Olsen significantly meets the limitations of claim of claims 2 and 3 except for disclosing that the first prize requirement is arranged in each of a plurality of classes where the higher one of the classes is more difficult to be satisfied. Seelig et al. discloses that prizes requirement is arranged in each of a plurality of classes based on the final placement of the horse in which payment is greater for the player who's horse that finishes in the higher position. Certainly because one has to move past a plurality of horses, then it would be more difficult to achieve first place in the race (column 3, lines 17-24; column 4, lines 5-13). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to incorporate the placing order or Seelig et al. into the horse

Art Unit: 3714

racing game of Price/Olsen for the purpose of imitating real horse racing on an electronic device.

4. Claims 4 and 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Price in view of Olsen in view of Palmer et al. (U.S. Patent No.6,939,224).

Re claims 4 and 9: Price discloses a first amount of a gaming value is inputted by each player to execute the game, and a second amount of the gaming value is outputted to each player as a result of the game; and the master machine manages the second amount of the gaming value in each of the gaming machines. However Price does not disclose that the amount outputted is in accordance with an one hundred percent or less ratio of the first. However Palmer et al. discloses a gaming device having varying risk player selections that a computer can adapt the payout of horses to be lower than the player's wager or the payout can be zero (column 3, lines 44-50. Because Palmer et al. discloses a range for payout inclusive of a payout range of 0% to 100% of the player's initial wager, the game device incorporates the limitation of a payout between 0% and 100%. It would have been obvious to try to incorporate the percentage range of Palmer et al. with the game machine of Price and Olsen in combination, for achieving the predictable result of a payout between 0% and 100%.

.

Art Unit: 3714

Re claims 4 and 9: Price discloses a first amount of a gaming value is inputted by each player to execute the game, and a second amount of the gaming value is outputted to each player as a result of the game; and the master machine manages the second amount of the gaming value in each of the gaming machines (column 4, lines 51-67; column 5, lines 1-4). Nakagawa et al. does not disclose that a ratio of a total of the second amount of a total of the first amount converges on 100% or less, for each of the gaming machines. However, Mindes discloses that in games where the underdog is usually not much less likely to win that the favorite then there are relatively small differences odds placed on the game and almost always less than 2 to 1 (column 2, lines 45-55).

During a motorized horse race, players have no knowledge of previous races that could effect the manner in which they are betting and therefore no clear underdog or favorite can be chosen from the participating horses. Accordingly, when players place bets on horses that are random selected by the computer for placing, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to place odds that produce 100% or less output because there is neither an underdog or clear favorite.

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Price in view of Olsen in view of Palmer et al. in view of Barrie et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,837,728).

Art Unit: 3714

Re claim 5: Price as modified by Olsen significantly meets the limitations of claim 5, except for disclosing an accumulator, which accumulates a third amount of the gaming value which is predetermined ratio of the first amount; and a bonus presenter, which outputs all the gaming value accumulated in the accumulator is outputted to a station associated with a player who satisfies a second prize requirement. Barrie et al. discloses an accumulator, which accumulates a third amount of the gaming value which is predetermined ratio of the first amount (column 1, lines 19-49; column 2, lines 1-20); and a bonus presenter, which outputs all the gaming value accumulated in the accumulator is outputted to a station associated with a player who satisfies a second prize requirement (column 1, lines 19-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate an accumulator and bonus presenter as disclosed by Barrie et al., to improve on the game system of Price and Olsen in combination for achieving the predictable result of drawing casino attendees to the game machines with the excitement produced an increasing and substantial bonus jackpot.

6. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Price in view Olsen in view of Palmer et al. in view of Nakagawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,019,369).

Re claim 6: Nakagawa et al. discloses that the game machine comprises of a horse racing game in which the player bets the first amount of the gaming value with respect to at least one of the horses; the player receives winnings in accordance with the result

Art Unit: 3714

of the game and odd; and the condition of the game includes at least the odds (column 4, lines 51-67; column 5, lines 1-4). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to place odds on the participant horses in the game of Price/Olsen combination so as to mimic a real horse racing gambling environment, which would have encouraged more casino attendees to play the game.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Price in 6. view of Olsen in view of Hanai (U.S. Patent No. 5,816,920).

Re claim 8: Price and Olsen in combination significantly meets the limitations of claim 8, except for disclosing that the master machine is located in a game machine. However discloses Hanai, which discloses a game system and method of entering game system in which a master machine is located in a game machine (Abstract). It would have been obvious to one in the art to place a master machine in a game machine for the purpose of adding game machines to a collection of game machines that are currently occupied with customers which would eliminate the problems of complex re-entry procedure of game machines as well and the halting of all the game terminals that are operating which loses money for the casino.

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Reginald A. Renwick whose telephone number is 571-

Page 9

Application/Control Number: 10/555,277

Art Unit: 3714

270-1913. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:30AM-5:00PM, Alt Fridays, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pezzuto can be reached on 571-272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

10/27/2007

SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER